

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/092,072	ROTHSCHILD, WAYNE H.
	Examiner Matthew D. Hoel	Art Unit 3714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Matthew D. Hoel, examiner. (3) Bill Pegg, applicant's representative.  
 (2) John Hotaling, primary examiner. (4) Jeremie Moll, applicant's representative.

Date of Interview: 08 August 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all, proposed amendment to Claim 10 in particular..

Identification of prior art discussed: Harkham, Larose, Cannon.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

**JOHN M. HOTALING, II  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicants discussed the basic version as having more content streamed to the gaming device and the enhanced version has having more content executed on the gaming device. The applicants did not believe the dealing of cards of Harkham anticipated the random event of the claims. The examiner asked the applicants to refine enhanced and basic versions. The examiner noted that games could be executed remotely with Flash, Java, or JavaScript. Claim 10 per the proposed amendment conducts a first wagering game at a gaming machine in a land-based casino and a second wagering game at a remote computing device. The proposed amendment to Claim 10 differentiates the devices by having the randomly generated event for the second wagering game generated at the central server. No agreement was reached. A new search and determination of novelty and non-obvious will have to be made when the applicants submit the amendments.